

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are currently pending in the application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 1-4, 13-15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Ohsato. Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Ohsato, further in view of Inoue. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Ohsato, further in view of Ogasawara. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Ohsato, further in view of Magnitski. Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Ohsato, further in view of Tada. Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Ohsato, further in view of Ogasawara, furthermore in view of Maeda. Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Ohsato, further in view of Magnitski, furthermore in view of Tada, even further more in view of Maeda. Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Ohsato, further in view of Tada, furthermore in view of Maeda. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 19 have been amended to recite “the first photo detecting section that adjoins the second photo detecting section.” In contrast, Kimura has light detecting elements 532 and 534 that are separated by light detecting element 533. Light detecting elements 532 and 534 are not adjoining. Thus, Kimura does not teach or suggest “the first photo detecting section that adjoins the second photo detecting section.”

Ohsato, Inoue, Ogasawara, Magnitski, Tada, and Maeda do not cure the deficiencies of Kimura. None of those references teach or suggest “the first photo detecting section that adjoins the second photo detecting section,” as recited in claims 1 and 19. Since the cited combinations do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1 and 19, claims 1 and 19 are not obvious over the cited combinations. Claims 2-8 and 10-18 depend from claim 1 and are patentable at least for the

reasons mentioned above. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 17, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Amy Kuo
Mark J. Thronson
Registration No. 33,082
Amy M. Kuo
Registration No. 62,374
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorneys for Applicant